

the specific name *bipunctata* Spinola, 1850 in favour of *croupius* Rolston, 1983. It seems a great advantage to accept the 133-year older name for the species; this gives more nomenclatural stability as any overlooked synonym published since 1850 cannot do any harm. Therefore, I suggest the rejection of proposals (1)(b) and (5) on BZN 49: 20, and the substitution of *bipunctata* for *croupius* in proposal (3)(b).

(2) L.H. Rolston

Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803-1710, U.S.A.

In response to the above objection by Holthuis to the suppression of the specific name *bipunctata* Spinola, 1850 and the placement of *croupius* Rolston, 1983 on the Official List of Specific Names, it appears to me that nomenclatural stability would be served best by suppressing a name used once and only once in primary literature and conserving the synonym that has been used in applied work by seven authors, in addition to my 1983 paper. There is a manuscript in press by two additional authors (G. Couturier & F. Kahn) that also uses the specific name *croupius*. This name has thus been used by at least 10 authors in 6 papers since 1983. Perhaps it is unfortunate that I am the author of the specific name proposed as an addition to the Official List. I am not biased because of authorship and shall not be in the least perturbed on personal grounds should the proposal be rejected.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the generic name *Helophorus* Fabricius, 1775 (Insecta, Coleoptera) as the correct original spelling

(Case 2796; see BZN 49: 30-31)

(1) A. Smetana

Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research, Biological Division, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada

I am in full support of the application by R.B. Angus to conserve the name *Helophorus*.

Angus correctly states that Illiger's emendation of the original Fabricius spelling of *Elophorus* to *Helophorus* is unjustified under Article 33b of the Code. However, the fact that the overwhelming majority of authors, both old and recent, used Illiger's spelling *Helophorus* should be taken into consideration. I would like to emphasize here that the spelling *Helophorus* is used in the recent and comprehensive treatment of the genera of hydrophiloid beetles by Hansen (1991); this will be used as the standard reference for many years to come. The spelling *Helophorus* is used consistently also in many recent non-taxonomic papers in the fields of palaeontology (e.g. Schwert, 1992), ecology (Koch, 1989) and economic entomology (Booth, Cox & Madge, 1990), and in recent catalogues and checklists (e.g. Lucht, 1987; Roughley, 1991).

A return to the original Fabricius spelling *Elophorus* would certainly not contribute to the stability of nomenclature.

Additional references

- Booth, R.G., Cox, M.L. & Madge, R.B. 1991. *IIE guides to insects of importance to man*. 3. Coleoptera. 384 pp. International Institute of Entomology, London.
- Hansen, M. 1991. *The hydrophiloid beetles. Phylogeny, classification and a revision of the genera (Coleoptera, Hydrophiloidea)*. Biologiske Skrifter 40. 367 pp. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Copenhagen.
- Koch, K. 1989. *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas. Ökologie*. Vol. 1. 440 pp. Krefeld.
- Lucht, W.H. 1987. *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas. Katalog*. 342 pp. Krefeld.
- Roughley, R.E. 1991. Family Hydrophilidae. Pp. 130–135 in: Bousquet, Y. (Ed.), *Checklist of beetles of Canada and Alaska*. Agriculture Canada, Ottawa.
- Schwert, D.P. 1992. Faunal transitions in response to an ice age: the late Wisconsinian record of Coleoptera in the north-central United States. *Coleopterists' Bulletin*, 46: 68–94.

(2) G.N. Foster

The Balfour-Browne Club, 3 Eglinton Terrace, Ayr KA7 1JJ, Scotland, U.K.

I write in support of the proposal to conserve the spelling *Helophorus*. I would like to draw the Commission's attention to the following points emphasizing the need for conservation of usage:

1. Angus has in press the most important text to be assembled concerning the genus *Helophorus* (*Süßwasserfauna von Mitteleuropa*, vol. 20, section 10, part 2). This has been severely delayed already and will appear with the name *Helophorus* used throughout. *Elophorus* would undermine the value of this *magnum opus*.

2. The genus includes one species (*Helophorus brevipalpis*) that is often the commonest insect in flight in western Europe, and therefore frequently appears in ecological publications. The genus also includes several crop pests. Reversion to *Elophorus* would cause confusion to ecologists, some of whom would resist the change and others of whom would remain in ignorance of it.

3. The genus features strongly in palaeoecological studies, another area in which it would be undesirable to cause confusion by change of usage.

4. Hansen's monograph (1991) incontrovertibly establishes the family status of the HELOPHORIDAE, whereas previously many authors have treated *Helophorus* as part of the HYDROPHILIDAE. A change in the name would cause confusion at the family level at a time when many workers have just adjusted to use of the name HELOPHORIDAE.

(3) Alfred F. Newton, Jr.

Field Museum of Natural History, Roosevelt Road at Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60605-2496, U.S.A.

The spelling *Helophorus* has achieved near-universal use for this genus and as the base for the family-group name based on it (HELOPHORINAE or HELOPHORIDAE). Although there have been a few recent uses of *Elophorus*, it is still possible at this time to avoid long-term confusion in the literature by conserving *Helophorus*.

M. Hansen (1991) used *Helophorus* and HELOPHORIDAE in his recently published comprehensive work on hydrophiloid beetles and M. Thayer and I have done the same in a work on family-group names in the HYDROPHILOIDEA and STAPHYLINOIDEA (*Fieldiana, Zoology*, in press). Both works are likely to be widely used as references for some time, which argues further for conserving *Helophorus*.

(4) J.A. Owen

8 Kingsdown Road, Epsom, Surrey KT17 3PU, U.K.

I have read this application with great interest and wish it to be known that it has my strong support.

(5) Paul J. Spangler

Department of Entomology, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

I strongly recommend that the Commission conserve *Helophorus* as the correct name of this taxon. Illiger's (1801) emendation has been widely used for very many years, as is documented in the application.

(6) D.T. Bilton

Institutionen för Genetik, Uppsala Universitet, Box 7003, S-75007 Uppsala, Sweden

I have recently seen the application to conserve the currently used spelling of the water beetle genus name *Helophorus*. As someone who has worked with aquatic Coleoptera for a considerable time I would like to support this application. *Helophorus* is one of the most familiar and widespread genera of water beetles in the northern hemisphere, and is known to many people other than students of the group. A return to the original Fabrician spelling would be most unwelcome to people familiar with these insects, and would only serve to confuse those who are not!

(7) Support for the conservation of the spelling *Helophorus* has also been received from Dr Hans Silfverberg (Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, N. Järnvägsgatan 13, SF-00100 Helsingfors, Finland).

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Schizopus* Le Conte, 1858 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2773; see BZN 48: 305–307)

(1) L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9157, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

The author of the application writes (para. 1) that he has not been able to ascertain the exact dates of *Schizopus* Le Conte, 1858 and *Schizopus* Claparède & Lachman, 1858 and he dates them therefore as 31 December 1858.

I can help with *Schizopus* Le Conte, which was published in vol. 10, p. 70 of *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* (1858). The 'Index to the scientific contents of the Journal and Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia', published in 1913 by the Academy, has a chapter dealing with the dates of publication of these two serials. On p. xii there is a note that of the *Proceedings* (1858 = vol. 10) the receipt of the first part (pp. 1–88) was acknowledged by the American Antiquarian Society on 19 April 1858.